1 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 3 ---- X 23-CR-0099 4 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff 5 Vs. Buffalo, New York 6 SIMON GOGOLACK, September 14, 2023 Defendant 8 TRANSCRIPT OF DETENTION HEARING 9 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JEREMIAH J. MCCARTHY UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 10 11 U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE - BUFFALO BY: NICHOLAS COOPER, ESQ. 138 Delaware Avenue 12 Buffalo, New York 14202 13 Appearing on behalf of the Plaintiff 14 FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER BY: JEFFREY T. BAGLEY, ESQ. 15 300 Pearl Street Suite 200 16 Buffalo, New York 14202 Appearing on behalf of the Defendant 17 18 19 20 21 COURT REPORTER: Brandi A. Wilkins 22 scalisba@qmail.com Kenneth B. Keating Federal Building 23 100 State Street, Room 2120 Rochester, New York 14614 24 25

THE COURT: Morning. Please be seated. 1 2 THE CLERK: We're on the record in criminal 3 proceeding 23-CR-99 United States of America versus Simon Gogolack for a detention hearing and 4 5 arraignment. Present in the courtroom are Assistant 6 U.S. Attorneys Nicholas Cooper and Joseph Tripi. 7 Defendant Mr. Gogolack with Assistant Federal Public Defender Jeffrey Bagley and United States Probation 8 Officer Andre McCray. The Honorable Jeremiah J. 9 McCarthy presiding. 10 11 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Gogolack. 12 Good morning, Counsel. 13 MR. COOPER: Morning Judge. 14 MR. BAGLEY: Morning Judge. THE COURT: All right. Before we proceed to 15 the detention hearing, there has been an indictment 16 17 returned which is dated September 13, 2023. Mr. Gogolack, have you received a copy of the indictment? 18 19 THE DEFENDANT: I just did, yes. 20 THE COURT: Is there motion to unseal? 21 MR. COOPER: Your Honor, at this time, the 22 Government is moving to unseal the indictment. 23 THE COURT: Okay. That motion is granted. 24 Um, Mr. Cooper, do you want to briefly summarize the 25 charges and the potential penalties? It seems to me

they're -- I didn't compare word for word, but they seem to be the same charges as alleged in the complaint. Is that correct?

MR. COOPER: That's largely correct, Your Honor. Um, any changes may be to date ranges charged with respect to count one, but the substantive charges are the same. I'll summarize the indictment. It's a five count indictment and that it includes one forfeiture allegation.

Count one charges the defendant with narcotics conspiracy beginning on or about July 2, 2023, and continuing until on or about August 8, 2023. Specifically that the defendant conspired to commit the following offense, that is to possess with intent to distribute and to distribute fentanyl, cocaine, methamphetamine, marijuana and Xanax. That narcotics conspiracy carries a maximum penalty of 20 years imprisonment. There's no mandatory minimum associated with that offense.

Count two charges the defendant with maintaining a drug involved premises in violation of Title 21 United States Code Section 856(a)(1). The timeframe is again July 2 through August 8, 2023. The premises is 296 Scott Avenue, Wellsville, New York. And there is no mandatory minimum associated with that

offense. The maximum penalty is 20 years of imprisonment.

Count three charges the defendant with possession of firearms in furtherance of drug trafficking. The date range is the same as the two aforementioned counts. That's in violation of Title 18 United States Code Section 924(c)(1)(a)(1). There's a five year mandatory minimum penalty associated with that offense which is required by operation of law to run consecutively to any other penalty associated with this offense, and there's a maximum possible sentence of life imprisonment with respect to that count.

Count four charges the defendant with being a felon in possession of a firearm and ammunition. The date range for count four is July 21 through August 8, 2023. And um, it alleges that the defendant possessed a specific firearm and ammunition in violation of Title 18 United States Code Sections 922(g)(1) and 924(a)(8). That offense carries no mandatory minimum and a maximum penalty of 15 years imprisonment.

Count five charges the defendant with being an unlawful user of controlled substances in possession of a firearm and ammunition. The date

range is the same as that in count four. That's in 1 violation of Title 18 United States Code Section 2 3 922(q)(3) and section 924(a)(8), and that also has no 4 mandatory minimum and carries a maximum possible 5 penalty of 15 years imprisonment. THE COURT: Okay. Sir, you have the right 6 7 to remain silent. Anything that you say may be used against you. Um, however, you cannot be compelled to 8 testify against yourself. You are legally presumed 9 10 innocent of these charges at the present time. 11 you have the right to be represented by an attorney, 12 and if you cannot afford an attorney, one will be 13 appointed for you. Now, you recently were charged in 14 a criminal complaint and counsel, um, was appointed 15 for you. Are you asking that Mr. Bagley be 16 reappointed? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Do you accept the reappointment, 18 Mr. Bagley? 19 20 MR. BAGLEY: Yes, Judge. Thank you. THE COURT: Okay. Do you waive the formal 21 22 reading of the indictment? 23 MR. BAGLEY: We do. 24 THE COURT: And how does the defendant 25 plead?

6 MR. BAGLEY: Not guilty, Judge. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, at the complaint 3 stage, I also issued a -- orally and in writing a 4 Brady order to the Government. Does anybody wish me 5 to repeat that or will it be deemed continuing in 6 effect? 7 MR. COOPER: Judge, I acknowledge the 8 Court's order and I understand it to be continuing in effect. 9 THE COURT: Mr. Bagley, do you agree? 10 11 MR. BAGLEY: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Um, then --13 well, do we want to do the -- the detention hearing 14 now or do we want to talk about a scheduling order 15 first? I leave it up to counsel. MR. COOPER: I'm ready to go with the 16 17 detention hearing unless Mr. Bagley has a different 18 position. 19 MR. BAGLEY: Yeah, Judge. I think detention 20 hearing first would make sense. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, you both 22 received the pre-trial services report dated August 23 30; is that correct?

MR. COOPER: That's correct, Judge.

MR. BAGLEY: Yes.

24

Case 1:23-cr-00099-LJV-JJM Document 88 Filed 03/04/24 Page 7 of 55 7 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Cooper? 1 2 MR. COOPER: Your Honor, the United States 3 is asking that you detain the defendant in this case, 4 and I'm going to go through -- I have a power point 5 presentation and I'm going to ask you first if you are 6 able to see that on the screen in front of you. 7 THE COURT: Yes. MR. COOPER: Okay. So the basis that the 8 9 Government is moving for detention, Judge, are under 18 United States --10 11 THE COURT: Well, before you mentioned -you mentioned your power point and I know at prior 12 13 stages there was -- you had indicated that you had 14 some information that you had shared -- attempted to share with prior counsel. He was not able to access 15 16 it for whatever reason, but I assume that Mr. Bagley 17 has had access to whatever you are going to be talking about. Is that correct? 18 19 MR. COOPER: That's my understanding, but 20 you can ask Mr. Bagley to confirm it.

MR. BAGLEY: Judge, I don't know what's in the fancy power point, but I did get um --

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: He didn't say it was fancy.

MR. BAGLEY: It looks pretty -- it's already looking fancy to me, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Well --

MR. BAGLEY: He's got the case heading and everything, Judge. Um, but I did get discovery from -- from the Government, Judge, um, pictures, videos, you know, things like that. So if that's what's in this um power point, Judge, then I did receive that information.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. COOPER: Okay, great. All kidding aside, Judge, this case is in my view as serious as it gets. Um, the indictment in this instance is the tip of the iceberg, and we'll get into that in a little bit more detail later. I always start with the basis for detention. Here it's 18 United States Code Section 3142(f)(1)(a). 922)g) is a crime of violence, 924(c) is a crime of violence, and that allows the basis for detention.

18 United States Code Section 3142(f)(1)(b) because the defendant is charged now by indictment with a 924(c) offense with a maximum of life imprisonment that's a basis for detention. Under 18 United States code 3142(f)(1)(c) because the defendant is charged under the controlled substance act with a penalty that has a statutory maximum over ten years that's a basis for you to detain him.

Under 18 United States Code Section

3142(f)(1)(e), any felony that's not otherwise a crime of violence that involves the possession or use of a firearm or destructive device or any other dangerous weapon, that's another for you to detain the defendant. Under 18 United States Code 3142(f)(2)(a) because there's a serious risk in this case that the defendant will flee, and I'll discuss that in more detail in a bit, but that's a basis for you to detain this defendant.

And under Title 18 United States Code
Section 3142(f)(2)(b), a serious risk that this
defendant will obstruct or attempt to obstruct justice
or threaten, injure or intimidate or attempt to
threaten, injure or intimidate a perspective witness
or juror, and we're going to get into that in a little
more detail, but that's a basis for you to detain the
defendant.

On top of having numerous basis to detain the defendant, there's two applicable statutory presumptions that say this Court should presume the defendant should be detained under Title 18 United States Code Section 3142(e)(3)(a) because of that Title 21 offense with the statutory maximum of at least ten years and under 3142(e)(3)(b) there's a

presumption the defendant should be detained because of the 924(c) offense.

THE COURT: Okay. And um, apologies in advance. Are there any mandatory minimums on any of these charges?

MR. COOPER: So Judge, as we discussed with the -- during the arraignment, the 924(c) offense carries a five year mandatory minimum penalty --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. COOPER: -- that has to run consecutive to any other sentence.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. COOPER: Other than that, the current narcotics offense that's charged in this indictment does not carry a mandatory minimum.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. COOPER: So we've summarized the charges already. I'm going to skip through these. We've gone through the detention basis. Gone through the presumptions. The factors under 3142(g). The first factor for the Court to consider is the nature and circumstances of the offense. Here we have the possession of a loaded shotgun in furtherance of drug trafficking which is an inherently dangerous and violent crime. In the incident case, the defendant's

cell phone is chock-full of text messages and photographs that make it clear that he's a drug trafficker. The defendant's cell phone also makes clear that he has access to numerous firearms.

During the search warrant at the defendant's residence, law enforcement recovered a tactical shotgun and they recovered body armor, and no matter how hard the defendant tries today to distance himself from that shotgun or from that body armor he cannot because the text messages and photographs in his phone make it abundantly clear that the shotgun belonged to him and the body armor belonged to him.

The weight of the evidence against the person. This is a factor that probation doesn't consider when making their recommendation, and I point out that even though they didn't consider that, probation still recommended that you detain this defendant. The weight of the evidence here is considerably strong.

The search warrant for the defendant's cell phone establishes I would submit beyond any doubt that the defendant is involved in a narcotics conspiracy. The contents of the defendant's phone establish that he's a drug dealer and that he possessed numerous firearms and body armor in furtherance of that drug

trafficking activity.

A search warrant at the defendant's residence yielded recovery of a tactical shotgun, ammunition, body armor, drug paraphernalia and suspected drugs or cutting agent for drugs, and that's consistent with what you will see and hear from his cell phone. Here are just a couple of the photographs recovered from the defendant's cell phone, and in order to keep this power point under 500 slides, we had to make some selections. This is a photograph of what appears to be drugs --

THE COURT: Again, I'm assuming unless you tell me differently that all of these have been shared with Mr. Bagley; correct?

MR. COOPER: So Judge, all of this and more has been shared with Mr. Bagley, first of all. This morning I emailed Jeff two new pictures because they weren't in that initial disclosure because I intended on relying on them today.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. COOPER: And I would just like to point out that's above and beyond what the law requires which is that I not be required to turn over discoverable material before a detention hearing, but we've gone above and beyond to do that here.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. COOPER: These are photographs of what obviously appears to be drugs taken from the defendant's phone. This next photograph I would submit to a jury and to the Court right now that this is 924(c) in a single photograph. Here we have hypodermic needles, a semi automatic firearm with a laser on it, which the defendant text messages with various people about trying to sell, another firearm above that semi automatic pistol, it's unclear to me what that is, ammunition in a tupperware, alcohol, pill bottles and what appears to be tied off plastic bags of drugs.

There's not a better picture on earth to demonstrate possession of a fire arm in furtherance of drug trafficking than this picture in front of Your Honor. This is pulled from the defendant's phone and the photo, Judge, it's not from May. It's not from last year. It's from July 21, 2023. And the metadata from the extraction is underneath that photograph.

This next photograph, the defendant possessing a semi automatic firearm. This is seized from his phone. Again, the photo was created on July 21, 2023. The next slide the defendant taking photographs of more pistols again July 21, 2023. And

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

14

we'll get into the text messages in a little bit where the defendant is trying to sell these firearms, offering to sell these firearms including to drug dealers.

More photographs that the defendant took depicting firearms. Again, the metadata establishing that these photos were taken on July 21, 2023. More firearms, photographs taken by the defendant on July 21, 2023. July 21, 2023, a photograph of a firearm that we've seen in an earlier photograph next to drugs and drug paraphernalia. Here it is in the defendant's hand. And then we have a photo from the defendant's phone on July 21, 2023, depicting a shotgun and a human leg and a bed with shotgun shells, and a few things I point out about this photo, Judge, A, that's the shotgun we seized from his house, B, those shells are the same shells that are littered on the floor when law enforcement responds to the death of CQ, and C, those same shells were recovered during the search warrant by law enforcement.

Here's more photographs of the shotgun that I'm sure the defendant is going to deny possessing July 21, 2023. We have a laser sight coming off of a shotgun with spikes on the end of it and we're going to get into more about what the defendant did with

this shotgun in a little bit. Here's a photo seized from the phone of CQ who was with the defendant in the days before her death. So we're talking about July 28, 29, July 30, leading up to her death on or about August 1. This photo shows the defendant holding the shotgun that was seized from his house.

THE COURT: How do you know that's the defendant?

MR. COOPER: Judge, the same shirt was seized from the -- or a shirt that appears to be the exact same shirt was seized from the defendant's residence and I would submit to the Court that between the photos from the defendant's phone of the same shotgun and the male who fits the defendant's description holding the shotgun and the circumstances that CQ was with this defendant that entire weekend and this photo was pulled from her phone that you can make an obvious inference that it's the defendant.

Text messages from the defendant's phone that establish that the defendant is a drug trafficker. Now, again Judge, I'm going to proffer to the court, but Mr. Bagley has all of these text messages, and I would just like to read some of them to Your Honor now. I can't pull them up on the screen but these are pulled from a cell bright extraction of

the defendant's cell phone. All this has been turned over. The defendant has text messages with the contact stored in his phone, one of them, this is a contact stored as Bill. July 28, 2023. Simon texts 175 for 3 Gs for the next one to spend and much more after that and boi. Judge, that text message is an obvious drug selling text message. 175 for three Gs, three grams for the next one to spend. The next message after that and much more after that and boi, B-O-I.

Now, you'll see if you reviewed all these texts from the phone, boi B-O-I and food over and over again. Boi and food are terms that are constantly used in Western New York to describe heroin, heroin and fentanyl. Those text messages occur over and over again in the defendant's phone, and I'm just going to read you a very brief summary of the you hundreds and hundreds of messages where this defendant is selling drugs.

What's particularly disturbing though are text messages that he has to a person named Clinic Shawn, and Judge, in these text messages, it's apparent that the defendant is picking his customer base from people that are going to methadone clinics trying to get sober. And so what the defendant does

is pick off people trying to get help and sell them fentanyl.

Here are these texts to Clinic Shawn. He says good soft hard and food. I'll take care of you. Soft being powder cocaine, hard being crack cocaine and food being fentanyl or heroin. Clinic Shawn responds to the defendant okay, what's good? There's text messages with a source of supply in the defendant's phone and the defendant has this person stored as a contact called Deal.

Those text messages discuss drug trafficking where it's apparent that that's a source where this defendant gets his fentanyl from. The defendant texts this drug dealer about selling him a high point pistol. The drug dealer says, hey, high point still around? And Simon responds yeah. Four hours later, Simon texts this drug dealer saved in his phone as Deal and says high point and Deal responds he ain't want it. Take a picture with the 50 in the hand joint.

Now, high point is a semi automatic pistol,

Judge. They're talking about selling firearms to drug

dealers here. July 8, this defendant texts Deal and

he says silver mini Draco with four clips for 1325 and

Deal responds let me see it and Simon responds got to

get a pic. I tried it out on the fourth. It's ill. 1 2 THE COURT: It's what? 3 MR. COOPER: Ill. It's awesome, very cool. 4 Great gun. On July 10, Simon texts Deal asking where 5 he is, and Deal tells Simon run to the clinic and see 6 who needs some boi. I'm going to give you a few 7 samples to give away. It's disgusting behavior, Judge. Simon responds that's like perfect timing 8 9 because I just had four people hit me up and I'm riding with three more who want it. Then Simon texts 10 11 I'm about 30 minutes away and I need one and one 12 again. 13 Now, again, working on drug investigations 14 for a long time, Judge, one and one again is in 15 reference to one gram of fentanyl and one gram of crack cocaine or one gram of heroin and one gram of 16 17 This is common drug trafficker parlance. They crack. discuss money and the drug source of supply complains 18 that Simon is not paying him with straight money. 19 20 (There was a pause in the proceeding.) There's I would say 21 MR. COOPER: 22 approximately two dozen separate conversations with 23 different people, either drug customers or drug 24 traffickers, that occur during the month of July

through August when the phone is seized by law

25

enforcement. The phone is filled with drug trafficking. One thing I'd like to point out to the Court is that the defendant was with this person CQ who was a witness in a federal case the weekend of July 29 and 30 leading up to August 1 when CQ is called in dead by this defendant.

The defendant during those same dates over that weekend, July 27, July 28, is texting people indicating that he has heroin, fentanyl or crack cocaine for sale, and I can read some of those text messages to the Court. So one example, Judge, on July 27, somebody asks the defendant, Yo, can you 100% get addies or adderall? And this defendant responds just sold 45 in the last hour. So that's just adderall, but I want to find this fentanyl text message from that same weekend, that July 28 weekend.

(There was a pause in the proceeding.)

MR. COOPER: Okay. So July 26 is the text messages to Clinic Shawn where the defendant is indicating he has good soft and hard and food and he'll take care of Clinic Shawn. July 28, 2023, this is the weekend before CQ's death while the defendant is with CQ. Simon texts said he has 175 for three grams for the next one to spend and much more after that and boi, and as we've discussed, boi is a

reference to fentanyl or heroin. The defendant texts again and says \$70 for a bun, B-U-N, which is a shortened term for bundle which is the way that heroin or fentanyl is packaged in small bags wrapped in a bundle.

That same text messages advertising \$175 for three grams is sent to numerous people as an outgoing text message in the defendant's phone. On July 26, 2023, the defendant texts a contact in his phone stored as Brandon Big and says you like that pic I sent you? That shit is special edition with a heat activated beam. It holds 13 but small and light as fuck. Brandon Big responds what pics? And then three hours later texts Ooouuuu and Simon responds fire, I told you.

So what we know about the defendant just from reviewing his cell phone, Judge, is that he makes a profit, makes a living selling drugs to people trying to get sober at methadone clinics, that he tries to sell his guns to drug dealers. That's corroborated by the photographs filled in his phone of guns and drugs, and it's corroborated by witness testimony that the Government has developed during the course of its investigation. I'm going to pick back up now where we left off in the power point

presentation. Hopefully. Come on, Power Point. 1 2 (There was a pause in the proceeding.) 3 MR. COOPER: So this is the shotgun that you 4 see depicted in both the photograph from the 5 defendant's phone and the photograph from CQ's phone. 6 This is a photograph taken by law enforcement when 7 they searched the defendant's house on August 8. If you look closely on the left side of the photograph 8 9 you can see the same spikes on the front of this 10 shotgun that existed in those pictures. They're a 11 very specific item. THE COURT: Go back to that photo. 12 it looks like it's almost in an attic or something. 13 14 Do you know where? 15 MR. COOPER: That's exactly where it is, 16 Judge. So the search warrant occurred on August 8 17 which is a week after the defendant called law enforcement and reported CQ as dead. 18 19 THE COURT: Right. 20 MR. COOPER: I'm going to get into some of 21 the things that law enforcement believes that the 22 defendant did at the scene where that occurred in a 23 minute, but the gun is tossed up in the attic in the

rafters by the time law enforcement searchs on August

8. Here's some other photos from the search warrant

24

25

at the defendant's residence on August 8. On the bottom left corner is the body armor.

Now, that same body armor is referenced in text messages that the defendant exchanges with actually as recent as July 28, 2023, the defendant sends a text message indicating that he's wearing his vest during what appears to be a confrontation.

There's a digital scale. There's a white powdery substance and a razor blade.

Don't need to be a rocket scientist to know that that's drugs or cut. I doubt it's baking soda. And in the center photo here, we have a digital scale, tin foil, a straw. These are items seized after the defendant's had an opportunity to clean his house up.

Continuing with the factors under 3142(g), the history and characteristics of this defendant. The defendant has a significant substance abuse history. The defendant has a prior probation um violation/revocation. The nature and seriousness of the danger to any person or the community that would be posed by this defendant's release.

Well, first of all, the obvious. He's selling drugs, possessing firearms and body armor.

That poses a serious threat to society. However, what I would like to spend some time with the Court on now

is witness tampering and intimidation because --1 2 THE COURT: Before you do that --3 MR. COOPER: Yeah. 4 THE COURT: -- he's not charged with any of 5 that now, is he? 6 MR. COOPER: Not in this indictment, Judge. 7 THE COURT: In any other indictment? MR. COOPER: Judge, I would submit to the 8 9 Court that that's going to be coming in the near future. 10 11 THE COURT: Okay. Well --MR. COOPER: And then there's both testimony 12 13 and corroboration which you are going to see in a 14 second about this witness tampering that occurred, and 15 something I expect you are going to hear during the course of the detention hearing today is that the 16 defendant offered to turn himself in or self surrender 17 to the FBI but this witness tampering incident and 18 19 there's mor than one witness tampering incident 20 occurred after the defendant called and offered to turn himself into the FBI. 21 22 THE COURT: Well --23 MR. COOPER: So what we have here is reports 24 from witnesses, multiple witnesses, more than one with 25 corroborating evidence that between the time of the

search warrant at the defendant's residence and the time of his arrest, the defendant communicated, and it says with at least one individual, I can confirm for the court now it's at least two individuals and attempted to intimidate and threaten them from communicating with law enforcement.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I'll listen to your proffer in that regard, but I just want to note that he is not charged currently with witness tampering, and I'm going to take that into account in assessing all of the factors.

MR. COOPER: Well, Judge --

MR. BAGLEY: Judge, this is also -

THE COURT: No need to argue with me, Mr. Cooper. I said I will listen to your proffer, but I just want it noted that he's not currently charged with any of that. So go ahead.

MR. COOPER: Absolutely, Judge. So I would ask the Court to keep open eyes and open mind to the information in front of you regardless of whether an indictment has been returned yet on these charges because obviously it takes time to present cases, bring witnesses into the Grand Jury. It's not a question of if so much as a question of when.

THE COURT: I've noted your position and

```
1
      you've noted my position.
 2
                MR. COOPER: Yes, Judge.
 3
                THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
 4
                MR. COOPER:
                             The next slide up on your
 5
      screen here is a cash app payment from this defendant
      on August 14, and I don't know if the Court uses cash
 6
 7
      app or Venmo or these electronic payment systems --
                THE COURT: None of the above. I'm sorry.
 8
 9
                MR. COOPER: I'm sorry?
                THE COURT: I do not. My kids do I'm sure.
10
                MR. COOPER: So just -- and I didn't mean
11
12
      that with disrespect.
13
                THE COURT: No, no. I appreciate it.
14
                MR. COOPER: I just wanted to educate the
15
      Court, when you send a payment on Venmo or CashApp,
      you have to include a memo or a note with it.
16
17
                THE COURT: Okay.
                MR. COOPER: So I send you $5 and I say for
18
      coffee because you bought me a cup of coffee, I have
19
20
      to include that text some sort of comment. It can
21
      even be an emoji like a smiley face.
22
                THE COURT: Okay.
23
                MR. COOPER: In this instance what we have
24
      is the defendant sending a CashApp payment to a
25
      witness and the defendant sends $1 so a nominal amount
```

and the message is for sixth amendment. Now, this is before the defendant is even arrested by the FBI.

It's after his house has been searched and it's after he's offered to turn himself in, and he's sending messages to witnesses or people he believes are witnesses against him and telling him for sixth amendment.

Now, I can tell the Court that the people who received those messages didn't even know what the sixth amendment meant so they Googled it, and when they Googled it they saw that it was the right to confront your accuser, and the people who received these messages, and it's more than one person, perceived it as a threat from this defendant.

The nature and seriousness of the danger to any person or to the community that would be posed by the defendant's release. One of the things I want to show the Court is what was observed at defendant's house during the search warrant. During the search on August 8, they found numerous identification documents of other individuals inside the defendant's residence.

These IDs included someone else's license to carry firearms, someone else's medical marijuana card, someone else's driver's license, all in the names and bearing photographs of other individuals, and these

individuals all share common physical characteristics as in being white males with this defendant.

But there's more than that. The defendant has specifically impersonated an individual by the name of Scott Drummond previously. Now, we could receive witness testimony from numerous individuals that they've personally witnessed the defendant pretending to be this other person named Scott Drummond, in possession of photo ID in the name of Scott Drummond with this defendant's photo on it, and what we have here in the green is a text message that the defendant sends to what I believe to be a bail bondsman pretending that he's Scott Drummond.

And so he's taking on the identity of another person and he's using that in association with essentially a participant in the criminal justice system. He's trying to bailout his girlfriend from her burglary case and he writes down that he's Scott Drummond from Wellsville. When he was arrested, he was in the wallet of Scott Drummond. When law enforcement responded to the death of CQ, the defendant told them that Scott Drummond lived in his house and it was Scott Drummond's side of the house where CQ was found dead. That was a lie.

The defendant lived in the one room that's

occupied in the house. The remaining rooms of the house are completely delipidated but the defendant represented to law enforcement that there was this essentially a duplex and that he lived in the other side with the attempted to displease distance himself from the dead body inside of his house.

Law enforcement took 300 plus photographs from inside that house during the search warrant. There's no chance anyone lived in the other side. The rooms are completely filled with trash. There's holes in the ceiling. There's power tools laying all over the floor. There's no functional bed, no functional couch, no functional refrigerator, no functional bathroom, but he lies to the police when they show up at the scene of this um -- this woman's death to attempt to distance himself.

There's also photographs in the defendant's phone of sensitive Government credentials. Now, because that's part of an on going investigation, I'm not going to post those photographs in this power point. They've been turned over to the defendant and to defense counsel under the terms of the protective order that we've agreed upon, and I have them here in a folder which I can hand up to the court so you can look at them, I would request that essentially the

```
Court review them under seal so that they are not
 1
 2
      publicly displayed to the gallery, but Mr. Bagley has
 3
      them, I have them and I'd like to hand them up to the
 4
      Court with your permission.
 5
                THE COURT: Okay. Um, Mr. Cooper, back to
 6
      this Scott Drummond. Are you saying that he's a -- is
 7
      he a real person?
                MR. COOPER: Sure is, Judge.
 8
 9
                THE COURT: Okay. And these documents were
      found where?
10
11
                MR. COOPER: So these were photographed and
      the photographs were in the defendant's phone.
12
13
                THE COURT: Okay. Do you know whether the
14
      person --
15
                MR. COOPER: There's an ongoing
      investigation and that's all I can say about -- I
16
17
      don't have an update. I know there's an investigation
      by an appropriate agency, but I don't want to speak
18
      publicly more than --
19
20
                THE COURT: I'm just wondering whether this
21
      person is a real person or not or you don't know.
22
                MR. BAGLEY: Yes. It's a real person,
23
      Judge.
24
                THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.
25
                MR. BAGLEY: The defendant's actions
```

surrounding the death of Government witness CQ which is currently under investigation. On August 1 at 6 p.m. the defendant calls 911 to report that CQ was present in his residence and apparently dead. By the time the defendant called 911 to report her death, CQ's body had already become cold to the touch and stiff.

By the time law enforcement arrived, it was apparent that she had been dead for a significant period of time before her death was reported. The area she was dead, the living space within 296 Scott Avenue is very small. There's essentially a studio apartment style in one of the rooms of the house and that's essentially the only room of the house that somebody could occupy or live in. So it's not like the defendant was upstairs in the attic where you saw the shotgun. This is the area that's occupied of the house. That's where she's found dead. She's cold to the touch, rigid and stiff.

Local law enforcement believed when they arrived that the defendant was high on Methamphetamine and they observed him drinking large quantities of straight liquor while they are attempting to interview him about this person's death. The defendant appeared evasive to members of local law enforcement about her

death. He made inconsistent statements to them regarding the circumstances surrounding her death.

While speaking to local law enforcement, the defendant claimed that CQ had committed suicide.

Separately, the defendant also made statements to local law enforcement saying to make sure the cause of death is found out. I will be the suspect if that's what's necessary to find out what happened to her. The defendant initially told local law enforcement that he was not present with CQ at the time of her death. He claimed he lived in the upstairs of the residence.

This statement by the defendant is demonstratively false as I've indicated to the court. There's dozens of the pictures of the upstairs of 296 Scott Avenue, and nobody lived there. The defendant later told the FBI during a recorded interview that he was sleeping next to CQ and didn't realize that she had died. So that's already two diametrically opposed accounts of his whereabouts and his involvement in CQ's death, and we know from the text messages, Judge, that he had food or fentanyl for sale the weekend that he was with CQ.

It's impossible to believe that the defendant was unaware that CQ was dead given the state

of her body at the time law enforcement responded to the scene, and I have photographs that I can show or hand up to the Court regarding the state of CQ's body at the time law enforcement arrived. Again, I'm not going to publicly display those, but with Your Honor's permission, I'll hand them up.

THE COURT: Mr. Bagley has had access to them?

MR. COOPER: Judge, I believe that those were turned over in the packet of discovery, but I can hand them a copy as well when I hand them up to you.

(There was a pause in the proceeding.)

MR. COOPER: On top of being deceptive with law enforcement by his statements about CQ's death, the defendant was also um when law enforcement goes to the house to conduct a search they find a fire pit which is depicted in the bottom right corner of this power point slide, and in the fire pit is the comfortable from the bed as if it's ready to be burned.

This is the bed that CQ was found dead in.

Law enforcement, the locals from Wellsville when that
he arrived, indicated to the FBI in subsequent
interviews that they believed that the scene had been
cleaned up or tampered with by this defendant before

he called them. They indicated that they would generally expect to find more packaging and paraphernalia or items consistent with opiate use near a person's body if they had suffered an accidental overdose.

Those items were not present by the time law enforcement responded to the 911 call. It's suspected that the defendant hid items including firearms and controlled substances before calling 911. After being arrested in Depew on August 2, the defendant made unsolicited statements to local law enforcement about CQ's death. The defendant claimed that he had heard CQ on the phone with her lawyer and that she was telling her lawyer, that's a lawyer that this court knows, that she intended to kill or harm herself. The Government has spoken with that attorney who acknowledged that he spoke with CQ and indicated that CQ in no way mentioned harming herself and that she planned on attending a meeting with him and the Government later that week.

So the defendant is lying to the police unsolicited, just throwing this information out there to put out a narrative that CQ was planning to harm herself, but the attorney who practices in this courthouse who represented this woman said that did

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

34

not happen. She did not tell me she planned on harming herself. She was planning to come to a meeting with me and the Government the following week. So the defendant is lying to law enforcement and putting out this false narrative that she harmed herself and the attorney is denying that and saying that did not happen.

Judge, before I get to the burden, there's additional newly developed information, and again, because the way this works, we don't always get the information the same day that a person is charged by a complaint. This is not charged in the indictment, yet, but I'm going to proffer to you now that there are multiple witnesses to an incident where the defendant used the same shotgun that you've seen in those pictures to hold a drug user against his will in the defendant's basement for upwards of three hours, that he struck that person with the spikes on the front of that shotgun.

That incident was witnessed by another individual. Both of those individuals corroborate each other and describe the defendant whose wrapped himself in plastic from head to toe holding a drug user captive in his basement for over three hours. The Government is continuing to investigate that

25

information.

However, after the information came to the Government, we rereviewed the photos from the search warrant conducted at the defendant's house, and sure enough, the photos from the defendant's basement show plastic um drop cloth, essentially what painters would use, and a white plastic chair. Now, that's exactly what was described by this witness who essentially says the defendant lured him to the house by offering him drugs and then brought him down into the basement where the defendant was -- had set-up plastic from floor to ceiling in a little like on three sides and a white chair and that he then shoved the person into the chair, struck the person with the shotgun and held the person against their will for hours in his basement.

The same plastic -- or the plastic chair that was described by the witnesses and the plastic drop cloth that was described by witnesses is still in the basement when law enforcement goes and photographs the house. They didn't even know that they were looking for it, but afterwards while interviewing people who've purchased drugs from the defendant, the Government becomes aware of this incredibly disturbing conduct where the defendant has used that shotgun to

beat someone and essentially kidnap them by holding them against their will using the instrumentality of commerce which would be a cell phone to lure them to the house.

So the defendant poses an obvious danger to the community. The pictures, the text messages, the threats over CashApp should all convince this Court of that by clear and convincing evidence. The defendant also imposes a risk of flight. The Court should be convinced of that by the defendant's possession of numerous IDs, the defendant's willingness to use the identity of another individual repeatedly based on both witness testimony and the text messages in his own phone.

But I would point out that the burden first here is with the defendant to overcome the two presumptions that apply in this case, and I don't believe he could even get that far, but if the Court does believe the presumptions have been overcome, the Government has proven anyway by clear and convincing evidence that he's a danger and a flight risk.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Bagley?

MR. BAGLEY: Judge, the -- you know, the

rules in the detention hearing are pretty liberal, but

um we've gone pretty far off field from -- and I

didn't interrupt Mr. Cooper in his um -- in his stringent presentation this afternoon, um, but, you know, to take for example this last accusation that um apparently comes from some information -- somebody said to somebody who said to somebody who told the Government that something happened in a basement that I have absolutely no knowledge of, no ability to combat, no ability to argue against, Judge, puts us in a very unfair position. What you have heard here this morning and into this afternoon is essentially a closing argument made without the ability for me to present any kind of defense to that closing argument.

THE COURT: Well, why don't you focus on um what has been charged?

MR. BAGLEY: And I'm --

ago, I was listening to the proffer of uncharged events and I take that proffer of uncharged events and I take that proffer of uncharged events and I take that proffer very seriously, but um, I think my focus will be on what has been charged which in and of itself seems to me to be very troublesome. So go ahead.

MR. BAGLEY: Judge, and I understand, and I will focus on that. Um, I do think part of what I'd like to say though is -- is that, you know, when I say

when I compare this to a closing argument, obviously if this were a trial, we -- both the Government and the defense would have been able to um put on witnesses, would have had months and months and going on years in order to investigate in order to um bring defenses.

In fact, the entire time almost that Mr. Cooper was speaking, Mr. Gogolack was trying to talk to me in my other ear trying to explain and clarify and combat and dispute a lot of the things if not all the things that Mr. Cooper was saying. So obviously, if this were a trial, I would stand up and I would have months and months and I would use my witnesses, but I'm at the disadvantage now because the Government has been investigating this case since the beginning of August.

They didn't charge Mr. Gogolack until the end of um -- end of August, and so they have um months of time to be able to put in and put their spin on the things that you've seen in front of you this morning. So for example, what do I mean when I say spin? One example of that, Judge, and again, I can't go through every single piece of evidence that they've presented to me this morning and um back and forth with them on that, but with respect to for instance the photos that

they showed you in the power point, they mentioned — the Government mentioned that one was was recently taken as of July 21, 2023.

I don't know if you notice this, Judge, but in fact all of the dates on those photos were July 21, 2023. So that raises a host of questions. Why are all of those -- why are all of those pictures dated July 21, 2023? I think it stands to reason that the picture wasn't taken on July 21, 2023, but rather that it was uploaded or saved or done some sort of um -- something happened with the -- with the device on that date rather than that it was taken.

So that tends to suggest that we don't know the date in fact of when this picture -- when those pictures were taken. We don't know in fact with respect to the pictures, whether those pictures that are on -- allegedly on his phone um were taken by Mr. Gogolack. You in fact asked a question, Judge, I think a fair one about, whether or not that um picture that the Government claims depicts Mr. Gogolack holding a firearm is in fact Mr. Gogolack. And so these are all just -- just brief and short examples of the types of things that um again make it -- make it pretty unfair for us to be able to sit here and combat against a closing argument that the Government has

clearly spent hours putting together when the only -the only determination before this court at this
time,.

Judge, as you know is whether Mr. Gogolack poses such a serious risk of flight that he is going to flee from this charge and whether or not he is a danger, and whether or not, Judge, and on that last point of course, whether or not there are conditions that the Court can impose that would alleviate any concerns that the Court may have with respect to dangerousness.

Um, the Government did not talk about several of the factors in 3142(g), Judge, which are family ties, employment, length of residence, financial resources. It did talk, Judge, a little bit about -- the Government that is did talk a little bit about drug and alcohol abuse and that's something that I would like to focus on.

The pre-trial services report is replete with um Mr. Gogolack admitting candidly that he is a user of controlled substances, that he has a controlled substance um problem, and that he um is --struggles with that, that he used as recently as um days and hours prior to his arrest. And so that is proffered to the Court as a reason to detain Mr.

Gogolack.

I would submit, Judge, that it's a reason to release Mr. Gogolack and to get him some treatment.

Um, a jail is not a place where folks who are suffering from controlled substance disorders get any kind of treatment. Um, they may go attend a meeting or two, Judge, but it is not the same intensity as um a facility designed to treat folks in Mr. Gogolack's situation, Judge.

So I'll cut to the chase a little bit. What my proposal is going to be to the Court is that Mr. Gogolack be released to a treatment facility such as Horizon or Stutesman and I spoke with the probation officer -- officers before today's court appearance. Um, typically, that as you know, Judge, having dealt with this probably hundreds of times that there's not always a bed available.

I'm not asking that Mr. Gogolack be released today and um on his own recognizance obviously, Judge. What I'm asking is that um in fact you do detain Mr. Gogolack but that you detain him only until the point that a bed becomes available at one of these treatment facilities. I know that the Court is often concerned about the security of these facilities in terms of whether or not, um, you know, Mr. Gogolack is going to

be under -- under lock and key. What I can report to the court, Judge, is that although it's not a jail by any means, he's under constant supervision.

There are 24 hours a day. So were Mr.

Gogolack not to be where he was supposed to be, it would be discovered within short order. In fact, I had a client not too long ago, Judge, that was released from one -- because he was doing well, he was released from one more stringent um location to a less stringent one where he's granted more liberties. So Mr. Gogolack were he to be admitted into this type of facility would be in that first situation.

Again, constant supervision 24 hours a day, several people on site that are there designed to first of all of course treat Mr. Gogolack for his serious substance abuse problems, and two, um, to make sure that he's not going anywhere, and if he were, probation would find out about it in short order.

And so, Judge, you know, that ties in a little bit again to the coloring that you saw this morning. Um, you know, to take -- you know, the Government got to look through Mr. Gogolack's phone. They got a month and a half in order to do that, and they got to pick out the things that they thought were the most damming for Mr. Gogolack, and then they got

to sit there and argue to the Court that certain -make their interpretations as to what those things
mean; right? This isn't a case where Mr. Gogolack had
sales to an undercover officer.

This isn't a case where there's a confidential informant who has come in and said Mr. Gogolack sold me drugs. Instead they found pictures for example on his phone of a bag of a white substance and it is claimed that Mr. Gogolack is selling this white substance. That, Judge, is good enough for a proffer I suppose under the liberal rules of evidence that apply here today, but I'd ask the Court to apply some healthy skepticism to that because again we're not in a position to be able to combat that just yet. And I think based on what Mr. Gogolack has been trying to tell me the entire detention hearing that down the line we will be in such a position.

Judge, Mr. Gogolack's father is here today. His name is Paul. Um, Paul is a lifelong resident of the Western New York area as is Simon. Um, he does have family ties to this area. Mr. Gogolack has also been employed for some time. He owns his own small business in which he um repairs small engines and he does odd construction jobs, Judge. In fact, one of the things that Mr. Gogolack is concerned about upon

the prospect of detention is that there are jobs out there that he's only half finished and that he would like to conclude. So that -- you know, that's a factor that the Congress has said the Court must consider and it's one that I think works in Mr. Gogolack's favor.

Another factor, Judge, that the Court can consider is financial resources, and I think um many of my clients are in a position where they don't have a lot of financial resource, and although Mr. Gogolack does work, he's not a wealthy man. What that means I think, Judge, what I'd ask the Court to consider with respect to that is that he doesn't have the means to buy himself a ticket flying out of this country or anything um of that nature, Judge.

You know, the folks who in my experience actually flee from charges which are few and far between, we sit here and we argue about this on a daily basis, but there's a handful of cases out of the hundreds and thousands that apply where a defendant has actually fled from a charge, and those handful, Judge, are usually the folks who have the means to do that. Mr. Gogolack does not. Mr. Gogolack lives here his whole life. His family lives here his whole life. He's not going to go anywhere, Judge. He's eager, as

evidenced by this detention hearing, to defend against these charges.

So Judge, I would ask that you consider those um -- those circumstances as you -- the Government tried to preempt a few of the things that um it correctly assumed Mr. Gogolack and I were going to present this morning and including the fact that he did call the FBI at one point because he was -- he did know he was under um investigation because of this unfortunate circumstances with the death that occurred in his residence, and said look, you want me to come here. Here I am. Come get me. Where can I turn myself in? Again, that shows that Mr. Gogolack is not a flight risk.

Nor Judge, I think it should be pointed out that there's a lot of circumstances here that are again presented in a light if I may least favorable to Mr. Gogolack. Um, you know, there was drugs found in a residence and um -- and it happened to be that an unfortunate situation occurred where um this woman passed away while she was in the same residence as Mr. Gogolack, but there's no other connection between him and this woman. He didn't -- he's known the woman for some time, but they just met recently again 10 -- or two weeks before this incident occurred.

So Judge, what it appears to me is that there's a wrong place wrong time situation. If Mr. Gogolack who, you know, the Government makes a lot about him trying to distance himself from the fact that this woman died, but of course, it's he who calls the police that morning when he finds her unresponsive. So if he wanted to distance himself from the situation, he wouldn't have called and reported the death, and he wouldn't have done all the things that he did in order to try to make sure that this does get solved um because Mr. Gogolack is in fact interested in getting this um resolved.

Um so, Judge, for those reasons, again, my proposal is um understanding that the Court must consider the weight of evidence but it's only one.

It's only one factor that the Court has to consider, and it's the least important factor because Mr.

Gogolack as you again had said, Judge, already this morning is presumed innocent of these charges. So despite, again, I will say fancy presentation from the Government on this point, um, this is not a trial and Mr. Gogolack is presumed innocent of these charges, and so for those reasons, I'd ask that you would release him to either Horizon or Stutesman, a place where he's going to get intensive supervision and

intensive care, and you don't have to do that, Judge, until there's a bed available, and there's going to be a host of other conditions that the Court is -- we're going to have no objections to that the Court I'm sure is going to apply and that probation is going to recommend that are going to be -- amount to the least restrictive as the Court knows that's the requirement to impose the least restrictive conditions in order assure his appearance and ensure the safety of the communication.

So while jail may be of course the easiest answer, it's not what the Court is obligated to consider. What the Court is obligated to consider is imposing the least restrictive conditions in order to meet those two factors, Judge. So I would submit that the least constructive condition is in fact this treatment facility.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. COOPER: Judge, I just want --

THE COURT: Very briefly.

MR. COOPER: -- to hit on a couple things, sure. The first thing is with respect to --and I understand the Court's position, I'm just trying to make a record. With respect to the witness tampering despite the fact that it's not charged, in United

States versus Vendetti, a District Court case from the Western District of New York, May 26, 2011, the court held the Second Circuit has recognized that pre indictment efforts to persuade witnesses still constitute witness tampering and are relevant to assessing a defendant's danger to a community and potential future conduct.

And so I believe it is something that this
Court should take very seriously. It's not just two
witnesses who have told the Government about it, and
it's not third level hearsay. It's the people
themselves coming here and saying this happened to me,
but we have corroboration. You looked at it. So I
think you should consider that very seriously.

The second thing that I would say, Judge, with respect to putting the defendant in a treatment facility, I come to Your Honor frequently in these sorts of proceedings, and I have on multiple occasions agreed to that, consented to it. It's something that I take seriously is if a person needs to be in treatment and if that's an acceptable position for the Government to take, I go along with that.

In this instance, Judge, that would be putting the fox in the hen house. This defendant is the person picking off the people in treatment to sell

them fentanyl. And if you go and send the defendant to a treatment facility and he starts giving dope to people who are trying to get well, that would be on this court. It's not something that we need to do is take that chance, put the defendant in a treatment facility where he can continue to sell drugs to people trying to get treatment which is what he's obviously been doing.

It's demonstrated in his text messages.

It's demonstrated by witness testimony. So the

Government is strongly opposed to that. It does not aswage the concerns about the danger that he's poses to the community. The least restrictive means in this case is jail, Judge.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Um, the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges at this point. That's a presumption for trial, but under the bail reform act, I'm entitled and obligated to consider many factors, one of which is the weight of the evidence, and as I said to Mr. Cooper earlier and in fairness to the defendant and Mr. Bagley, while I do not ignore the proffer relative to uncharged incidents that may end up being charged, I give less weight to the proffer in that regard than I do to the proffer that falls within the scope of what's already

been charged, and the proffer as to what's already been charged is very significant, very detailed.

It indicates -- regardless of when these photos were taken, it indicates that um photos from his cell phone clearly, strongly suggest that he was dealing in both drugs and in firearms at some point. Um, the fact that the shotgun um was apparently located in the attic of the house suggests that some effort was made to conceal his involvement in the dealing.

Um, there is a presumption against release based on the nature of the charges. If I merely confine myself, and I do, um, to the proffer relative to what's been charged, I find that he has not rebutted the presumption, and I agree with -- I don't always agree with Mr. Cooper, he knows that, but I do agree that um placing the defendant in a treatment facility given what I've heard from the proffer would not certainly be in -- it might be in his best interest. It's certainly not in society's best interest.

So I find at the present time that the defendant has not rebutted the presumption.

Therefore, I find by clear and convincing evidence that there is no condition or combination of

conditions which would reasonably assure me that if released he would not pose a danger to the community, and I find by a preponderance of the evidence that there is no condition or combination of conditions which would reasonably assure me that if released he would not pose a risk of flight.

But I will -- Mr. Bagley, I note you have been at a procedural disadvantage. You appeared in this case only just over a week ago, and I know that you've received the materials which are the subject of the proffer. You have had an opportunity to review them. I don't know how much time you've had, but I will say my ruling right now is detention.

I'll give you the opportunity based on changed circumstances including further review of what you've seen um to apply to reopen the hearing, but at this time, that's going to be my ruling. Um, now, let's talk about a scheduling order on the indictment. How much time, Nick, for voluntary discovery.

MR. COOPER: Judge, voluntary discovery in this matter based on the conduct that's charged in the indictment is largely complete based on what I've provided so far, but I'd ask the Court for 30 days to allow the Government to obtain any additional material that's discoverable under Rule 16 and provide it.

THE COURT: Okay. So today is September 14. 1 2 So why don't we say October 14 is a Saturday. How 3 about October 16, Monday? 4 MR. COOPER: That works for the Government. 5 Thank you, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Jeff, how much time for 7 defense motions? MR. BAGLEY: Judge, just briefly on that 8 9 matter because I know Mr. Cooper takes a very literal view of the discovery obligations that he has, Judge. 10 11 So there is an indictment now. I do make a formal demand for discovery, and we are entitled to it now 12 13 with that demand, Judge, so it's not technically 14 voluntary anymore, Judge. So just that clarification 15 but --16 THE COURT: Well, okay. 17 MR. BAGLEY: -- um, I'll take, Judge, I think -- I think, Judge, if what I have in terms of 18 19 discovery is essentially um -- essentially complete, 20 then, Judge, I think just maybe 30 days from the 16th. THE COURT: Okay. So that would be 21 22 Wednesday, November 15. And um --23 MR. BAGLEY: That is the week that, Judge, 24 I'm on trial. Maybe we could push it to the following 25 week, Judge.

53 THE COURT: Okay. How about Wednesday, 1 2 November 22? 3 MR. BAGLEY: Thank you. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Um, how much time for the 5 Government's response? MR. COOPER: Just if -- two weeks is 6 7 acceptable to the Government if that's acceptable to 8 the Court. 9 THE COURT: Okay. That would be December 6. Um, Eric, do you want to give us a date and time for 10 11 oral argument? THE CLERK: Yes, Judge. Thursday, December 12 13 14 at 2 p.m. 14 THE COURT: Is that acceptable to counsel? 15 MR. BAGLEY: Yes, thank you. 16 MR. COOPER: It's acceptable to the 17 Government. Thank you, Judge. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Cooper, do you wish to be heard as to the speedy trial act between, what 19 20 did we say, November 22 -- or today and November 22? 21 MR. COOPER: Yes, Judge. Thank you. Judge, 22 the Government is asking that the time between today's date, that's September 14, 2023 and November 22, 2023, 23 24 be excluded from the speedy trial act pursuant to 25 Title 18 United States Code Section 3161(h)(7)(a) and

3161(h)(7)(b)(4).

During the time between today and November 22, 2023, the Government is going to um compile and provide any outstanding discoverable material to Mr. Bagley. During that timeframe, I expect that Mr. Bagley is going to review that discovery and discuss it with his client. Um, he'll also need that time to prepare motions which he's requested a schedule to file, and so it's in the best interest of the defendant that this time be excluded to allow him to obtain discovery, review discovery and file motions, and those interests outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a speedier trial. And so for those reasons, we'd ask that the time be excluded.

MR. BAGLEY: No objection, Judge.

THE COURT: I'll adopt counsel's representations as my findings concerning an exclusion of time between today and November 22, 2023, from the speedy trial act calendar. For the reasons stated by counsel, I find that the ends of justice served by the granting of the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 70 days will remain on the calendar as of November 22, and if motions are filed, then time will be further excluded by operation of law.

One final matter just so the record is 1 2 I'm going to return to Mr. Cooper the 3 photographs that were handed up to me, so I'm not 4 making them part of the record right now. 5 MR. COOPER: That's fine, Judge. THE COURT: Um, but I don't -- particularly 6 7 given that one is a -- of a sensitive nature, um, I --8 I'm not going to retain it. It will -- the Government will retain it. 9 MR. COOPER: I acknowledge receipt, Judge. 10 11 Thank you. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you all. Defendant 13 is remanded. 14 (Proceeding concluded at 12:31 p.m.) 15 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER 16 17 I certify that this is a true and accurate 18 19 record of proceedings in the United States District 20 Court for the Western District of New York before the 21 Honorable Jeremiah J. McCarthy on September 14, 2023. 22 23 S/ Brandi A. Wilkins 24 Brandi A. Wilkins 25 Official Court Reporter